

enrolled Titus among his co-workers, he enrolled him as a Gentile convert, entitled by a God-given right to membership in the Church without circumcision. He was insisting on the freedom of the Gentile converts from the yoke of the Mosaic law. He was maintaining the case of Titus in order to make it a test case, and to illustrate the significance and the operation of the decision of the Council of Jerusalem.

The case of Timothy was different in two respects. One was that his selection as a co-worker with Paul was subsequent to the Council. The question of the rights of the gentile converts had been settled. There was no need of any further protest. But beyond this, Timothy was not of purely Gentile stock. His mother was a Jewess. Having one believing parent, he ought to have received the seal of his faith in his infancy. There had been neglect of duty. To have enrolled him while the taint of this neglect was on him, would have encouraged negligence in Church duty among many others. Paul called on him to live up to his privilege and to set before the world an example in this regard.

In each case therefore Paul had a good reason for his conduct and was acting in full consistency.

### NEW ORLEANS AND THE STORM.

Whenever a storm of a little more than usual liveliness strikes the coast of Louisiana a host of people begin to be concerned about the consequences to New Orleans. Especially is it feared that the city will be overwhelmed by a great tidal wave. This is, with many, based upon the unwarranted belief that the city is so low and so dependent upon levees for its protection, and so near the waters of the gulf that it must surely one day succumb. As a specimen of this notion the press dispatches from Atlanta to Louisville last week had these marvelous tales to tell: "It is known, however, that the storm . . . had sent the waters of the Mississippi three feet above the usual stage. It is known also that New Orleans is five feet below the sea level, and that its only protection against a flood is its levees and dykes. That these are strong and high is conceded, and in this fact lies the hope of safety for the beautiful former capital of the former French Empire in America."

For the benefit of those who do not know the facts, but who may be enough interested in the truth to wish to know the real state of the case, we desire to state that New Orleans is on the Mississippi river, and not on the Gulf of Mexico; that it is one hundred and ten miles above the mouth of the river; that the swelling of the river from the effect of the high tide in the gulf is not regarded as a source of danger to the city; that a great tidal wave in the gulf would have to rise scores of feet in order to cross the intervening country and do any damage as far inland as the city; that New Orleans is not five feet below the sea level, but several feet above the sea level; that even when the Mississippi river, by reason of freshets above, reaches a level which is above the city and is held in by the levees, were these levees to break or crevasses, as they are called, occur, there would be no likelihood of the water covering the land more than two or three feet deep except just at the break. New

Orleans is like Hamburg or London, two of the greatest seaports besides itself in the world—it is well inland, on a great river, far enough from the sea to be in safety so far as the sea is concerned, and yet near enough to give accessibility to the commerce of the seas. The depth of its river to the mouth of the same is sufficient for the passage of the largest warships of the United States with ease and safety, and the whole length of this section of the river is like a great harbor.

Many utterly unwarranted notions prevail outside concerning the situation, the health conditions and other interests of the city. They prevail just in proportion to the maliciousness of those who desire to circulate them and the ignorance or gullibility of those who are willing to swallow the reports. Taken altogether, New Orleans is about as safe a place in time of storm, and as healthy a place in time of sickness as any city in the land. Its death rate compares most favorably, in the lowness of its percentage, with that of any of the large cities. In a single season of its now infrequent visitations of yellow fever, a scourge which is now not dreaded, since its method of transmission and prevention has been scientifically ascertained and practically tested and proved, it does not yield as many lives as any one of several cities of equal size must record in each year of their history from pneumonia and typhoid fever.

And like its great metropolis, so also the State of Louisiana is justly to be regarded as one of the healthiest as well as one of the most fertile States in the Union. It is growing with amazing rapidity. Its population is already well towards two millions of people. Its long summers may be trying to some, but they are not unhealthy. One will find as much longevity amongst its natives as in any other locality. The rigours of a wintry season are not known, a fact which more than offsets the length of its warm season. The happiness and content and security, as well as the growing wealth, of its people make life in many respects ideal. People do not live in Louisiana because they can not help it. They delight in their home. There is but one thing needed greatly here, and that is more of the precious gospel of Christ, to take the place of the abounding superstition of the prevailing Romanism and to prevent the demoralizing effects of too abundant worldly prosperity.

We have had a layman to express to us his wonder, and we think we noticed a trace of his displeasure as well, at the manner in which many ministers give out their names. He wants to know if it is a personal affection, a professional custom, or a form of family pride more fully developed in ministers than others. It is the habit of writing their names, or having them written, in full. If a distinguished lawyer is referred to in one of his professional journals or in the public press it is always as Hon. A. B. Smith, or C. D. Jones, Esqr., but when it is a preacher who is named, it is Rev. Alonzo Boswell Smith, or Rev. Dr. Copernicus Demetrius Jones. We think the wonder is not limited to the "laity." So far as we can gather, the world looks upon the habit as a laughable form of affectation.